## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

CORTEZ LARNELL MOORE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 19-cv-1206-NJR

JOHN BALDWIN, et al.,

Defendants.

## MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

## **ROSENSTENGEL**, Chief Judge:

This matter is before the Court for case management purposes. Specifically, Plaintiff Moore has failed to identify John Doe #1 and John Doe #2 as ordered by the Court.

Moore's Complaint (Doc. 1) identified two John Does who allegedly retaliated against Moore and failed to intervene to stop use of force against him (Doc. 15, pp. 4-5). On March 30, 2020, the Court entered an initial scheduling order setting a deadline of July 1, 2020 for Moore to identify the John Does (Doc. 41, p. 3). Moore was warned that a failure to identify the John Does would result in their dismissal from the case. As part of that scheduling order, Moore was directed to provide Defendants with all information in his possession that would help identify the John Does by June 1, 2020 (*Id.*). Defendants had until June 16, 2020 to provide Moore with the identity of the John Does or, if unable to make a specific identification, they were to provide him with documents and information to assist Moore in identifying the John Does (*Id.*).

On June 16, 2020, Defendants filed their notice of compliance (Doc. 50), informing

Case 3:19-cv-01206-NJR Document 54 Filed 08/03/20 Page 2 of 2 Page ID #709

the Court that they had not received any correspondence from Moore by his June 1, 2020

deadline. They indicated that they sought information on the officers who were escorting

Moore on the date and time in question but no incident report or any other identifying

information existed (*Id.* at p. 2). Without further information, they were unable to identify

the two John Does. Although Moore's deadline to identify the John Does was set for July

1, 2020, per Second Amended Administrative Order 261, that deadline was extended to

July 31, 2020.

As of this date, Moore has neither provided Defendants with identifying

information as required by the Court's Order, identified the John Does, or asked for

additional time to identify them. Because Moore failed to identify John Doe #1 and John

Doe #2 as required by the Court's Order (Doc. 41) the Court DISMISSES without

**prejudice** the claims against John Doe #1 and John Doe #2.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: August 3, 2020

NANCY J. ROSENSTENGEL

Many J. Roensteng

Chief U.S. District Judge